



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sions may arise, negotiations with any Government with which the United States has or may have diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences or disputes arising between the two governments which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agencies may be referred to arbitration and peaceably adjusted by such means;

"And that this House, cordially sympathizing with the purpose in view, expresses the hope that Her Majesty's Government will lend their ready coöperation to the Government of the United States upon the basis of the foregoing resolution."

Mr. Bayard, United States Ambassador to Great Britain, in communicating this action of the House of Commons to the State Department at Washington, said that the debate on Mr. Cremer's motion, at which he was present, "was entirely above the usual range of Parliamentary expressions." The Earl of Rosebery, British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, sent the following official communication, in July last, to Sir Julian Pauncefote, British Ambassador at Washington:

"Sir—I transmit to your Excellency copy of a resolution which was passed in the House of Commons on the 16th ult., expressing sympathy with the action taken by the Congress of the United States in favor of the settlement of international disputes by arbitration.

"Her Majesty's Government have pleasure in bringing this resolution to the knowledge of the Government of the United States, and would be glad if the President should see fit to lay it before both Houses of Congress.

"I request that your Excellency will communicate a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of State with an intimation to the above effect.

"I am, etc.,

ROSEBERY."

Here the matter rests for the present. The way is now more than open for our Government to begin negotiations with the specific aim of securing the establishment of a permanent arbitral treaty between the two countries. Following the history of this great movement, it is seen that England has kept pace with, if not actually outstripped, us in peaceful approaches. Our Government ought certainly to take and certainly will take during the present winter the next—and possibly the final—step in rendering war hereafter impossible between the two great English speaking nations—"two nations but one people," as John Bright was fond of calling them. We hope that President Cleveland may give prominence to the subject in his forth-coming message to Congress. No subject is more worthy of mention and of strong recommendation.

THE AMENDMENT OF THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT.

On the 4th of October Mr. McCreary from the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported to the House of Representatives a bill to amend the Geary act of May 5, 1892. The chief feature of the McCreary amendment is the extension of the time in which Chinamen now in this country may appear before the collectors of inter-

nal revenue and register and receive a certificate of residence. The bill was passed by the House on the 16th of October; but Mr. Geary, whose notoriety has steadily grown in the land, succeeded in getting it so amended that it is nearly as objectionable as the original act. The extension of time is, of course, a good thing, and many Congressmen, we understand, voted for the bill to save the extension clause.

The amendments introduced by Mr. Geary and finally incorporated in the bill provided (1) for a definition of the word "merchant" much narrower than its ordinary meaning; (2) for the furnishing of a photograph as a means of identification; (3) for the appointment of the marshal as the officer entrusted with the duty of deportation. Ten members of the House voted against these amendments, more particularly on account of the photograph clause, which was a part of Mr. Geary's original bill. The amended McCreary bill met with some strong opposition in the Senate, but passed without much study, as that body had worn itself out over the silver question.

While the extension of time provided for in this bill is a good thing, yet it by no means satisfies the enlightened conscience of the country, which has expressed itself strongly and with singular unanimity since the subject first came before Congress in this late and dishonorable form. The whole matter needs overhauling from the bottom up, and Congress ought not to let this winter pass without meeting the just and urgent demands of the country on the subject. There ought to be no restriction law touching immigration or residence which does not apply equally to all nations. There ought to be no restriction law of any kind which violates solemn treaty obligations which have not been abrogated by the mutual consent of the nations concerned. And more fundamental still, there ought to be no restriction law that will prevent any upright and honest individual of any land, to whatever class he may belong, from coming freely to this country for purposes of travel, temporary residence or final citizenship. We claim these rights for ourselves in every part of the globe, and it is in the last degree dishonorable in us to deny them to others of any race.

The Anti-Mongolianism of the California coast has been borne with long enough, and it is high time that Senators and Representatives of the other States, who see clearly, many of them, and feel deeply the dishonor that this "politics" legislation has brought us into should unite in expunging it from the statute book. Hon. William Everett, of Massachusetts, said in a speech on this subject in the House on October 14th: "There is something higher than legal enactments; there is something higher than a decision of the Supreme Court; there is something higher than treaties; there is something higher than the opinion of the Pacific Slope; something higher than the opinion of Massachusetts or the opinions of the United States and the opinions of the whole world;

there is eternal right; there is keeping faith beyond the strict law when you give your word; there is gentleness and there is mercy."

It is time that this "something higher" should show itself in the national legislature in reference to the Chinamen, whose patience and forbearance and good behavior have put to shame our selfishness and exclusiveness. If any restriction of Chinese immigration is necessary, which we very much doubt, let it be made in an honorable, American way. We are certainly not so far along in the stages of moral decline that this is impossible.

HAWAII.

It is impossible not to think and speak about the Hawaiian situation, difficult as it is, on account of the distance and the conflicting statements coming from different sources, to sift out the truth and say what is right. The problem is made all the more difficult by the number of questions involved in it, distinct to a certain extent and yet all closely bound together. What is best for Hawaii itself, in view of conditions existing there for some years past? Was the revolution inevitable and certain to succeed? Did the United States officials there interfere unduly during the progress of the revolution? What course should this country have pursued when asked to annex the islands? Is the proposal of the President and Secretary Gresham to use at least the moral force of the United States to restore the monarchy required by justice or is it unjustifiable on any theory which has been put forth as to the aid given the revolutionists by ex-Minister Stevens and Captain Wiltse? All these questions must be answered by one who would give a satisfactory solution of the problem raised, and the answers to some of them are greatly dependent on those given to the others.

As to the first question, there is very little difference of opinion. It is conceded by nearly all that the monarchy was rotten, and that it was determined to make things worse by the proposed new constitution which was to disfranchise the very best citizens of the islands, men who, though of foreign birth or of foreign descent, were as truly citizens of the country as any native Hawaiian. These men whose permanent home was there, who owned nine-tenths of the property and paid nine-tenths of the taxes, were to be sacrificed by a monarch who was notoriously corrupt and who sought to legalize the lottery and the opium den. This course of things, which for years had gone from bad to worse, made a revolution in the country not only inevitable but certainly morally justifiable. A Government of whatever sort is the servant of the people and has no right to exist when it ceases to serve their interests and deliberately plans the destruction of their rights. That a change in the Hawaiian Government was necessary and that a republic was the

only form that could meet the real wants of the nation is doubted by very few on American soil.

From all that has been said and written by those now on the islands and by those who have been there as public officials and as private persons, it seems clear to us that the revolution was sure to have come about and ultimately to have succeeded, even if no United States gunboats had been within five thousand miles of the islands. There is little doubt, to be sure, that the presence of the United States officials and forces gave encouragement to the revolutionists, as did those of other nations whose representatives so quickly recognized the provisional Government when once in power. But there is no reason to believe that the presence of the United States marines in any way materially affected the outcome of the revolution, whatever may be true as to the time or purpose of their landing. The result was sure to have come, the revolution being forced into existence by the corrupt purposes of the Queen and her minions, too inefficient, it seems, to know how to plan effectively to carry out their designs or to oppose the uprising against them.

As to the third question, the answer is by no means easy. Mr. Blount says there was undue interference, nay more, that there was a positive conspiracy to which the United States officials were parties, and that the provisional Government was really set up by the unlawful use of the United States forces. He supports this position by certain documentary evidence and by testimony taken in the island which on its face seems to make out a good case. This evidence has convinced President Cleveland and Secretary Gresham, and has led to the sending out of Minister Willis with instructions to make good the wrong done, by restoring Queen Liliuokalani to the throne, explicit instruction being given, however, not to use force until report should be made and further instructions received from Washington. This view of the matter of interference is further supported by ex-Secretary Foster's reproof to ex-Minister Stevens, for having acted too hastily. It must be remembered, however, that Mr. Foster's judgment was based upon Mr. Stevens' own report, and that the reproof was not for unlawfully supporting the revolution but simply for over-haste in doing his duty. Mr. Stevens, who had been for a considerable time in Honolulu and was an actor in the events, denies, in toto, that there was any interference or conspiracy, and says that the sole purpose of landing the United States troops was for the protection of the life and property of American citizens in case of a conflict, and that this landing was not made until the provisional Government was actually in power. He gives particulars as to days, hours and places, which he declares himself ready to go before any proper tribunal and bear testimony to. His statements are corroborated by Hawaiian Minister Thurston and by the letters of missionaries in the islands. It is difficult to see how these statements of eye-witnesses